

M646
Wednesday, September 16, 1964
New York City
Lunch

Mr. Nyland: Well, children, what is new. What will we talk about. Questions of life, you know?

Eve Hardie: I...

Mr. Nyland: You have something?

Eve: I'd like to, um... What I'd like to try to do is to eat Consciously, to try to...

Mr. Nyland: To eat Consciously?

Eve: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: Ask Robert. He has eaten Consciously several times. Robert, how do you do it.

Robert: Well, I think it's no different than doing anything else Consciously.

Mr. Nyland: Yeah, but that what helps, of course... You want to eat Consciously, so you have to tell her how to do it. Who has ever tried. Francis, what is your result.

Francis Winter: Well, I have tried it. Ah, it's something that I have thought about for a long time without trying, and I always seemed ... it's always seemed that I always felt, "Oh, that's too difficult," and "I can't to do it," or somehow... I am ... Sometimes I do try, and then I further try, and yet it ... yet it never seems to, uh, really be Awake, and then, ah, then I think that I didn't want to try because, ah, I thought that I wouldn't enjoy the food, or something like that.

Mr. Nyland: Well, that's right.

Francis: And, um, then in the past week I have been trying it at several times. And, uh, I've tried to...

Mr. Nyland: How do you go about trying it.

Francis: Well, I try to have something of me outside of me, seeing me lift up the spoon and, uh, put it into my mouth. And then I saw myself ... uh, try to see myself chewing it. And then usually just about then, when I start to swallow it—somewhere around there—uh, I seem to lose it.

Mr. Nyland: You lost it.

Francis: Yeah.

Mr. Nyland: How was it, Eve. Have you tried that?

Eve: I have tried it.

Mr. Nyland: Yea. And where do you lose it, now.

Eve: Well, I lose it when I eat fast.

Mr. Nyland: You didn't try it that way.

Eve: No. Not exactly.

Eileen Wright: Mr. Nyland, for whatever it may be worth, that ... if you gave me the kind of a task and, for me, ah, in regard to this, I found that if I would change my rhythm ... I happen to be a gobbler—I gobble everything down, usually—so what I tried to do as a task was to, um, try to eat as slowly as I possibly could, and I found it very helpful for me because I even found out, you know, the moments when I would fall down into the mechanicality of doing it fast and not chewing my food, which is my usual, habitual. So, I think it's a question of what is your habitual way of eating more than anything else, and if you can, ah, be 'non habitual,' as you've said so many times about your eating, possibly it will lead you to being more Awake.

Mr. Nyland: Yeah, what do you think of that, Eve.

Eve: Yes, well...

Mr. Nyland: How ... how do you eat, habitually.

Eve: You mean as to, ah, slowness or fastness?

Mr. Nyland: Yeah? Or, do you taste it?

Eve: Well, I taste food for about a minute and then it's just eating just to feed the body. I lose the taste of food.

Mr. Nyland: Couldn't you eat soup?

Eve: Too fast.

Mr. Nyland: Huh?

Eve: Yes, that lasts longer...

Mr. Nyland: But, when you eat cherries, after the second, you can't taste them.

Eve: No, I don't.

Mr. Nyland: And still, you have to try to see what happens with each time that you eat something; and, for that you probably have to be very slow. Because as soon as it becomes a regular habitual way of doing it, it's very mechanical; and we eat without any particular thought,

than only sometimes when it is too salty that you are reminded that you have something in your mouth. Otherwise, it's just a matter of chewing it, and down it goes into the stomach, and so forth, before you know, it is gone, but...

You know, when you're hungry, how fast do you eat?

Eve: Oh, sometimes very fast.

Mr. Nyland: Do you drink in between?

Eve: Once in a while.

Mr. Nyland: Coffee, or...

Eve: Coffee in the morning.

Mr. Nyland: When do you drink? Before you take a bite, or after you take a bite?

Eve: Usually afterwards...

Mr. Nyland: When you still have food in your mouth?

Eve: No. No.

Mr. Nyland: You don't.

Eve: No.

Mr. Nyland: It's a habit some children have.

Eve: Oh.

Mr. Nyland: They mix it, like cement.

Eve: When I asked, um, the question about ... also I was wondering if, when you are eating and you're trying to Observe how you are eating, um, if there is something, a way of distributing, in different parts of your body, the food.

Mr. Nyland: No. I don't think you can, and I don't think one ought to try. I think one should leave it to the wisdom of the body to distribute it and to digest it, dependent entirely on the state in which you are, sometimes physically quite right for it and sometimes not right. I think that the body itself is in different kinds of states, in which it will function differently. Under normal conditions, the less you think about it, the more the body will take care of whatever food it gets. And if you start to consider it from the standpoint of your mind looking at the digestion of your body, you probably will interfere with the ordinary function.

Sometimes you can follow it for a little while. For instance, you drink a glass of cold water, you can ... you can then sense it. That is very good. When you drink alcohol, it is possible at a certain point to realize very well that the alcohol passes through your 'vocal

chords,' as it were, and then, before it goes down to the stomach, there is a possibility of becoming quite Aware of that fact, as it leaves from the throat. At that moment, it is a very interesting moment; particularly with alcohol. You can do it with water also, but the question of alcohol, since it is a little different and it could be digested differently, at the point at which it could really start to be changed in not reaching exactly the same old way the stomach but where it can actually have a definite possibility of distribution and re-distribution, is at that point if one could be Aware. With it afterwards, if one is Aware, one can do a great deal with the body, and you can also direct, at that time, the food going into a certain way. And it is quite definite that if one is Awake, that then the digestion of the food takes place differently; so of course the reason for trying to Wake Up when one eats, is in order to give a much better chance to the food to be digested properly. But, for the time being one cannot do that because all the attention that is necessary is to try to remain Awake while you eat, and you have to use the ordinary functions of eating for the purpose of reminding.

So it is right what Eileen says, that if there is a certain habitual way of eating, any way you can change the habit will give an opportunity for you to become more Aware. Usually I think that the automatic way of a certain rhythm in which one eats, it is much easier to slow down instead of eating faster. Because, when you eat fast, you run the risk that you swallow it too soon and you don't digest it enough in your mouth and you don't extract from the food what you really can extract. If you can chew and keep your food a little longer in your mouth than usual, not to swallow it immediately when it reaches your mouth but simply to hold it; if you want to chew it, fine; if it is soup, hold it, don't swallow. At that moment when you really introduce an entirely different element—contra to the rhythm; you see, different from the rhythm—you then, because of the strangeness, you have a possibility of realizing you are doing something with your body.

It is then the mind which then, you might say, 'takes charge' of the body doing certain things under the guidance, or at least under the control, of the mind. It's a very good relationship, because if then I introduce Sensing, then there is something established regarding the physical behavior of the body which is recorded back into the mind; and that will help to Wake Up—that is, as a result I can be much more Awake because of the relationship between the physical part as Sensing and the mind registering.

So, one starts to eat already before you have food in the mouth. One becomes sometimes,

regarding eating, as if one wishes—and many times like a prayer before eating—is really to get into a good state. For instance, if the prayer says, “I am grateful that the food is here and I am thankful to God that He has given it,” I put myself in a certain state of wanting to receive something for which I am already grateful. And in the state in which I am grateful, that means I will take the food for whatever it is in the best way—whatever is *in* the food—in the best way that I can digest it.

The state in which I am while I eat has a tremendous amount to do with the digestion, and also with the result on me. For instance, when I am hungry, of course I take food. I like it; the hunger is stilled; the emptiness in the stomach is satisfied, and there is something then that I probably extract out of food because I have a certain feeling of well-being while I eat. The question of, when I pray and wanting to receive it, has a definite effect on my psychological state, gratefulness, something in which I feel that I am ready and happy to receive that. The question of laughter, a joyous meal, company; that one enjoys talking about this and that—maybe jokes, maybe something that puts one in a good state—almost as if the body starts to vibrate in accordance with the joy that may be there, so that a real good eater, a Man who enjoys his food... And it’s not a question of ever being Conscious, but a question of getting into a different kind of a state. A person who has a very nice stomach and he drinks a little bit and there, “Ha, ha, ha, ha, ha!”—like that—has a definite effect on the digestion of his food. A person who is in a hurry and has to go back again to the office and just stands at a counter and drinks a glass of milk and perhaps a little sandwich and then hurries over there, for him food has really no meaning, no more meaning than people who are creatures, and it is not placing the food in the right way.

So, there is much more involved in it if one wants to use eating as a means of Waking Up. I begin, already, by putting myself in a state that is really conducive to the possible digestion. In that, I already Wake Up *before* I start on food. Before I start, even, moving my hands in wanting to touch it, maybe I already look at it and say, “Ah, there it is.” Sometimes I can give this particular kind of way of looking at food—that I am going to eat something of value—that I say, “There is food.”

What does it mean—that it is food for me. I can elaborate much more, even, and say, “There is food, as a piece of bread. Where does it come from? What was it before? How did it grow into food? How did it happen to come here? What is the history of that what I am eating?”

This is an introduction, of course, of an entirely different section that has to do with a historical value, and to try to see in the result of that what has been started already several months ago when the wheat was still in the fields, before it was touched—before, even, the meal was made, before it went through the mill, before it started to be baked—all of that becomes, as it were, a certain ‘picture’ that I take first, before I take it as food. With this, perhaps, not much is left when I eat it, but it puts *me* in a different state.

It is necessary for each person to make his own gradations. And whatever they think as ... for themselves as what is of value, it has to be a personal decision by any one person. You see, they are very different for different people. It doesn’t matter at all. And I would say just try it for one week, after that we will all talk about it. I think that will be the best. Not too ... not too cumbersome. Not too many arguments and so forth. Just Work, and then we’ll see what happens because maybe out of that certain ideas will ... will start, and you can then agree what seemed Impartial, to be the best.

All right?

Voice: [inaudible].

Mr. Nyland: Yea, I would. Good luck. [chuckle] Goodbye.

Then, when I take food, I sense it. I sense it with my hand. I become Aware of myself already making a movement regarding it, and I am very slow—almost *before* I start to chew, that I am trying to remain Awake to the fact that here I am. My body is sitting to eat—to eat for a purpose, of course—but then, as I do it, all of me tries, now, to be present to that fact. And I try this, let’s say, for five minutes. And after that, I am exhausted, because it does require a tremendous effort because it is so unusual, and it is something that I want to use for the purpose of really, of trying to be Awake by being reminded, in eating food, that I—if I want to do it right—in the beginning it will be very difficult and not only time consuming, but also energy consuming.

If I do this for five minutes with that, and eating then slowly, and every time when my tongue is in my mouth mixing the food, the sensation I will be able to have—the movement of the jaws, the teeth, whatever it is that is functioning; the question of saliva before it is sufficient so that it can be swallowed. And after the swallowing—as I say, with a glass of water—it may be that I continue sensing it a little bit more, but usually I must then give it up because it reaches my stomach and then it is in the domain of my physical body. My mind has nothing to do with it

anymore.

You see what I mean? It is that kind of a process that I try to do, in a very slow way. And, if I am alone, it will be quite all right. If I am with other people, I cannot afford it; I cannot do it too much; only, I can do it, then, at certain times, and at a certain moment before I put a piece of bread in my mouth, maybe I hold it. I come to myself. I see it. I see myself waiting, and I put it in my mouth. No one has to know about it. I drink. I hesitate. I hold on to the cup. I sense it. I put it to my lips. I drink the first swallow very slowly—very. And it is when the liquid comes into my mouth, I try to remember.

You see, this requires energy and it requires also perseverance. Because if I really don't want to do it right, it is of very little use. If it is only sporadic, it has very little effect. But, if it is done in a certain, you might almost say 'systematic' way, I can get ... by means of food in a very simple operation like that I can get certain things out of that of course that I never would get out of it: The way I sit, the posture, the way I actually, when I am looking at it, take in that what is going to be. And then it will be; that is, I see in the future what is going to happen by already having with me the thought of having to eat, and then eating.

All of that belongs, together, to a possibility of trying to endure for a certain length of time the opposition of all the other things that will come in as a conflict. That is, the thoughts that I will have which will interfere, the particular tensions in my body that will come and that perhaps during such an intensive Observation I will want to re-sit or change my posture because I get cramps in my knee; or whatever it may be—the different things when I talk with someone who has nothing else but a little bit of nonsense to say, and still I have to listen to it while I am attempting to really establish a relationship between my food and myself. Also, the question of someone sitting there and having ... I having to perform a certain function, the question of sitting in a restaurant when there is noise, this very often is helpful. Because when there is noise going on which is not too loud, it flairs of a certain functioning in my body, and that uses energy which has to be used for the maintenance of the body. That is, I receive, with the maintenance of that what I now am engaged in, a form of energy from the outside which then is, through my ears, which finds its way to my mind, and stimulates my mind, in exactly the same way as the blood circulation is stimulated by the action of the heart, and for that a certain form of energy is simply set aside for the ordinary purpose of maintaining my life, maintaining my body for what it is. When that is satisfied and there is no particular need for extra energy to go in any other direction,

I can use it for the purpose of Work.

Gurdjieff many times wrote in restaurants, or wrote in a surrounding which took away, you might say, the 'edge' of silence. Driving a car. Automatically driving a car with the body—sitting there and not interfering with one's mind—takes up a certain form of energy which means that the body with the different functions is in a dynamic state. In silence—that is, if I sit quiet; even if I rest, even if I relax completely—I am so close to the possibility of becoming static that it is difficult to get certain things going when I am interested in Work. Because Work is a dynamic state. Work is a constant alertness—to Be, at a certain time, at that time; and to hold on for that moment and change over to the next moment, and the next moment when it comes—so I have to be active, and parts of me have to be active, and energy has to be active and be available for the purpose of Waking Up.

So, what is required is not a quiet state in just sitting as if there is nothing going on and I am dead. In Work, I never can be dead to the world. I must be active, satisfy that what is required for an ordinary existence—of that I call the 'maintenance' of myself and giving it the energy that is necessary for that, not more and not less, but enough—and then the extra energy which could be made available is already in a state of flux, and all that is needed, is then to be directed in the way I want to direct it.

You see what I mean. It is a big problem if one wants to use it as ... as a means for Waking Up, and it is much more involved in it than just sitting and eating a cookie. It depends, how am I when I wish to do it in the right way, *using* it, quite definitely, as an exercise. But, it is an exercise that has to be placed in the right way regarding me. If I don't do that, then it is just something, a little occasional thought that happens to come to me that I ought to Wake Up; by the time I try it, it is already past and I keep on thinking about my 'Work,' so-called, I'm not Working. You understand what I mean.

So, it's good for us. Now here we are, sitting together, you know, and who has tried it. And it is a common occurrence. We do it every day. Francis has a little bit, maybe a little haphazardly here and there. But, you have never have done it, really, as something that you would use. I have said several times, thousands of things are possible as opportunities in ordinary life, in a sleeping state, and we have to try to find out what the rest is ... most useful—or rather, certain activities that we do in a surrounding which is conducive. And by this time you ought to know what is the right time to try to make attempts of Waking Up, and that you really,

if you are serious—or rather, if you feel that something has to be done regarding Work or that you have to take a position regarding the ideas of Gurdjieff and that you want to assimilate them or use them or feel that it is something that is of value because it *is* food of a certain kind and you feel the necessity of having to use it simply because you say it's an opportunity—then it is absolutely necessary for *everyone* to find out: “Where is it that I can really remember myself.”

Maybe when you drink. When you drink in the bath ... I remember, once I gave a task about drinking at... We did talk about drinking armagnac once, but I also remember saying that one drinks to the health. I have a martini or a cocktail, and I have to finish it in four swallows. And at each swallow I go through the formality, of course, of lifting it up. I am together with a large group of people, and I drink some alcohol or maybe I drink ginger ale, but whatever it may be, I drink whatever it is that's in the container in four different sections. And the first section, I establish a relationship with myself drinking, having in mind that that what I do now is a particular kind of a functioning of myself, and the relationship that I see as necessary is to establish for myself first, that I am there, and that I am a human being alive and interested in the possibility of, while I do this, to Wake Up for the purpose of establishing a relationship with that what I call, at that moment, a ‘higher’ force. It has to do with the relationship of myself, which has nothing to do whatsoever with anyone around, and I start, with the first swallow, to establish this for myself—as it were, to find its ‘proper’ place.

I am ... because of the surrounding and I have to be sociable, I will, at a certain time, become sociable. But this—for the first drink—I don't want to be sociable. I want to establish, for myself, a private relationship towards my Conscience or towards God. It is a level from which I want to start whenever I go and enter into a new kind of a venture, and I want to make it a cocktail party adventure that I will not forget. I use the glass, simply when it touches my lips, to remind me, “I am here.” And when I drink, I then become Aware of myself drinking as if, in that, I establish a road towards a higher force.

I put it down. I let it simply function; it is in the body, now, so I have no further interest—the body has interest, but not I.

The second time when I drink, I include other people. Among the people of the group in which I drink, some I know and some I don't know. Some are strangers, some people are quite close. I include, now, those that are close. I drink for the personal relationships which are, at that moment, available to me and for the people who are, in relation to me, of that kind of

character. That is, I include, in myself, something of the little world which is a personal world and which requires, on my part, a definite attitude towards them of affection, of kindness, of a realization of having in mind, when I happen to think of them, of well-being for them and the possibility, if I can, of creating for them, if it is going that far, that whenever I say anything to them I make up my mind that I will say it in such a way that it could be useful to them.

It is the second drink. After I have drunk again, I forget.

With the third one, it includes the totality of the people who are there, acquaintances as well as all the people that I know with whom I have particular affinity. But, everybody is there for a purpose: To enjoy themselves, to have a chance to get away from boredom of life, maybe because they are really happy, maybe because they have nothing else to do. Whatever it may be, at that time, I call it simply ... not 'professional' necessarily, but it is an acquaintanceship which is really rather loose and it does not concern me very much, and the amount of energy that I want to spend at that ... unless I have something very definite in mind regarding myself functioning in that surrounding—as, let's say, professionally I want to extract something from it, then it takes on a different kind of a color because in that sense the third drink is important for me for the purpose of where...why *I* went to the cocktail party. That means I then start to determine what is the good that I can get from it professionally, if that is my aim, and that then, when I drink for the third time, I have in mind the possibility of utilizing that kind of a opportunity for that purpose.

Again, I say, I 'drink' with that: As the liquid flows through the mouth and I swallow, I am Awake to that possibility of myself and I see myself do this; and then, usually immediately after I try to fulfill a particular function for which I may have come professionally—to hunt up the person, or whatever it is that I want as a relation with the person with whom I want that kind of professional dealing.

It's the third drink. After I have drunk again, I am, as far as that drink is concerned, neutral.

The fourth one, it is a very important one. And very seldom do I reach it, because it requires a very definite special attitude, as if during the little experiment that one tries with this kind of thing—of drinking for the sake of oneself and Waking Up—that I, having opened it by means of a relationship towards God, that I close it with a relationship towards humanity. That is, I am now in a state in which I happen to be as a human being with many other human beings

exactly like myself, and that although I may have certain relationships with some of them and with another a little bit less, the totality of Mankind is, you might say, at that moment representative ... 'represented' to me while I am there.

And of course it may be limited in its particular scope, and the number may not be many. If there are many and different kind of types, I see myself among them as one of them—one of them as a type, one of them having a relationship as a human being to another human being in general—and what is my attitude towards them. It eliminates, at that time, dislike. It eliminates criticism. It brings forward a wish to understand—if I can see them that way—that they, like I, am mechanical creature, behaving automatic, behaving unconsciously; that I must—and this, I say, is exactly where I fail—I must take the opportunity of trying to see that in relation to them, if there is an opportunity of even exchanging anything, that I have to be very much on my own *qui-vive*—that is, to be alive to the fact that I have not any ... any allow ... any ... how will I say that: That I have no reason, or not even any obligation, or that that I am not entitled to show these people what my particular state is or to make them make up for the state of anger in which I may be; and that I, in relation to them, only feel that they are alive and that I understand them in their being alive and their struggle, if they do, or the difficulties in which *they* live if they are conscious of that; or perhaps I may, even, feel a little sad that they are not Conscious at all and that they have to fulfill their particular function in an unconscious state, and perhaps at times, even, I might wish them that nothing will ever disturb them and they can keep asleep.

But, I love them. This is what I mean. I have to have that kind of an affection of a form of life existing around me as something that is also manifested like I am manifesting, and that I, regarding that, have to make an acknowledgment of the existence of that and the purpose for which, perhaps, they were born. But, in any event, that I acknowledge the fact that they *have* been born and that I, at that moment, *happen* to be with them and that my attitude towards them is love of Mankind as a whole—to the extent that it is possible for me to manifest just that.

You see, the fourth drink is important. As I say, it gives the 'seal' to that affair of an experiment of a cocktail party.

You see, why do I go in detail about describing a thing like that. Because, on the face of it, it is nothing, and on the face of it we have done it hundreds of times. But it is—and it is not necessary to apply it to a cocktail party; it is not necessary to apply it to a drink, that one drinks in four parts—it is necessary to see, every once in a while, that there are certain situations in life

where you could very well use it, utilize it for your purpose but dividing it up into little steps as if you are going from one step to another, and that you keep yourself in hand in trying to make yourself behave in a certain way in respect to that what is the surrounding, and that you extract from the surrounding what may be useful to you.

You may go into a room; there may be people there, your family. It may not have anything to do with drinking. You may go to a church, there may be people there; you do not know them; there may be a service, there may be organ playing; there may be something, as if you escape for a little while from the street, maybe to meditate. Do it in steps. Take yourself as a first quarter of yourself, and try to maintain the quarter of yourself.

The All Quarter Maintainer. The Law of Four. The Law which means that I will be able to divide and divide and divide; that I can, after the division, build up again and again and again, until unity has been reached. This is the meaning of the Quarter Maintainer. It is not the Law of Three. It comes out of the Law of Three by the unity of 'I' seeing the entity of 'It'—then it is Four. When it is in that state, I can divide; then I can, out of the spheres, make quarter-spheres; out of the circle, I can make quadrants; out of a line, I can make divisions, equal partitions. I can make, even, a combination of that what is a triad with another triad, and connected with the two points, again making four—that is, the 'Do' which repeats itself in the higher 'Do,' and the 'Fa' between the triads.

All of that, it is a mode of living. It is a mode of living based on the triangles, on the Law of Three; of the Law of Seven, which is three plus four, again becoming One. It is the Law of practice. It is the Law of phenomenon. It is not the Law of noumena. Noumena is the Law of Three. The Law of Four and Law of Seven is the combination of that which I should be in relation to practical Work, knowing the Law of Three and understanding what is really the motivating force in one and the application, then, in allowing myself to be quartered.

This, I say, is the 'practical' application of the Law of Three, in Four. It is the relationship, as if I have two arms and two legs. It is different from two ears. It is different from one nose. It is different from one mouth. The four extremities of oneself represent, at times, certain parts which all have a meaning if I want to attach that meaning; and if I want to remember that while I am in practical life when I walk with two legs and I swing my arms, that even with this quartered entity I become One in respect to the receiving, from outside, the possibility of energy from different fields, different forces.

You remember, I gave an exercise once about the possibility of understanding what has gone on in the world as history regarding religion, and that at any one time a certain religion represented, among the people of that religion, a certain level of understanding which they, because of their work in accordance with whatever their understanding was and whatever they tried to do while they were working and that what then was created, because of them as a group, a certain denomination or a certain religion—together that they, as the four main religions of the world which we know about, have represented at that time, and still represent, a certain entity.

It is Tibet. It is Mohammedism. It is Buddhism. And it is Christianity. Sometimes that what is Jewish is linked up with Christianity, and as such it belongs together because both the Old and the New Testament are One. So, when I say ‘Christianity,’ I mean Protestant, I mean Roman Catholic, and I mean Jewish. Buddha is different from Tibet. Mohammedan is a little later religion, and the emphasis is on ... also in a different direction. With Mohammed, one can say also a little Persian, and the Persian, a little bit of the Hindu; whatever it may be that is mysticism in Arabia, how it is linked up with the religion of the East further, it is all a conglomeration. But, in a general way, there are four, and it is that kind of quarters—again, this kind of entity—which exists.

The exercise that I referred to is, when I Wake Up and I realize the necessity of wanting to Work and also that it is necessary for me to have certain forms of energy which could at that time help me, I try to represent in my mind, and I try to feel as if there is existing, way up in the sky somewhere in the universe but still within my means of reaching it and being able to visualize it, something as if it is a cloud, a combination of material which is represented by the level of understanding that one of these religions have made and is still in existence.

The question of Buddhism, it’s my right arm. The question of Tibet, it’s my right leg. The question of Christianity, it’s my left leg. The question of Mohammed, it’s my left arm. I Sense each one.

I Sense my right arm and I bring, at that moment, a relationship between that what is Buddhist religion—to the extent that I know it or understand it—and myself, and I open myself to the possibility of receiving that form of energy. While I Sense, I can say “I,” as if I wish, with that “I,” to establish that relationship. When I say, “Am,” I wish to seal it within me.

After this Sensing, I Sense my right leg. I establish the same kind of a relationship, then, with Tibetan religion—again, I say to the extent that I know it. It may be not so clear, but

whatever it is, it is there. They ... but it is, and I say “I, Am.”

My left leg, Christianity. I know much more about that. It has a very definite meaning. It is a little bit more recent. Sometimes I belong to it, or I have belonged to it. It is sometimes represented in my father, in my family, of something that still exists which I can see. And I see what is in it, at the present time, useful to me. All of that, as thought, goes through my mind, and my feeling is that I wish. And when I say “I,” this time I emphasize “I”; that is a relationship, it has meaning and it wishes, now, if it is possible, for me to be received—provided I Sense and thereby open the possibility of receiving it.

After that, my left arm, Mohammedism. It is active. It is God on Earth as Mohammed. It is related to many things that have gone on before, but it is quite definitely the acknowledgment of something that exists as Allah and Mohammed as a prophet. And, for me, I join in that attempt because, for me, God exists, and “I” am His prophet.

It is the All Quarter Maintainer of the body, of the psyche, and of an emotional entity which may grow out later to a Kesdjanian body. In that way, one prays. In that way, one could walk. In that way, one can remember at times during the day—when you are on the street, all of a sudden and *then* you bring about, at that moment, a connection—and you become changed because you are in a different state. It’s a form of life that kindles, within one, that what is real. It is point in which the cross—the two lines which are the quarter dividers—meet. That is the point of truth. That is the point of ultimate redemption of all dimensions into One. It’s the point of one’s Magnetic Center.

So, you see, for a meeting, we go off into all kind of philosophies.

Questioner: Mr. Nyland, ah, I wanted to ask you about this. There have been times that you have been ... mentioned, ah, Objectivity as far as feelings go, and then I get mixed up. But, uh, a question of Work, uh, does result in losing interest in certain things, either physical or emotional or even mental. I was having a conversation last night about, um, transference, and I wanted to, uh, ask you about this.

Mr. Nyland: Thoughts?

Questioner: No, uh, this has to do with a theory that I was discussing, uh, which this person claims to have experienced, uh, the whole idea being that if there are things that... This has to do with feelings, specifically.

Mr. Nyland: Feelings?

Questioner: Feelings.

Mr. Nyland: Yes.

Questioner: If there are, uh, first if there's praying ... that there are no real positive feelings until you can bring the negative feelings to the surface. And then, if you can, first of all, find out what these feelings are, this idea of transference is supposed to be that once, uh, you can transfer these feelings, you will lose interest in them if you feel they are of a destructive nature or if they are out of the realm of your control. Ideally, if you trust the person to whom you are supposed to transfer these feelings, you bring these negative feelings into it, which wouldn't happen naturally. This is ... this is a means of trying to so-called 'get' to the feeling center, and that's why I am bringing the question up. It, uh, sounded interesting, you know, as far as that goes, and it seems to be practical from what I have heard, and, uh, the whole thing, as I say, predisposes that you can bring these negative feelings to the surface and recognize...

Mr. Nyland: You know the Bible?

Questioner: Uh, I...

Mr. Nyland: There was a little goat, and very often was used, you remember, also...

Yes.

Questioner: As a sacrifice.

Mr. Nyland: Yes. And sent them to the desert. Remember, they transferred them to the herd of swine and the swine panicked—in the lake and ... the Sea of Galilee.

Questioner: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: It's the same kind of principle. Also, when one wants to communicate to someone who is older and he, you might say, 'controls' one, it is as if one then is lightening the burden on oneself by sharing it with someone, and that that person carries with you whatever the burden is, the burden is less—part of it has gone over to the other person; the other person cares, and is actually helping.

How much of that is like a transference of certain material that goes from one person to another, I think that it is undoubtedly true that there is material. It is not material in the ordinary form. It's material of an emotional kind, and that's where the materiality of it is quite different from material. But there is a certain way—very much like a thought can have a form—that feelings also have a certain configuration which belongs to it. It is not something that is necessarily negative. It is used in order to alleviate the suffering of someone, that the negativity

could be removed. And in general it is called that what is 'sin' for one, that the other will help you to carry the sin; and the whole purpose or the idea of Christianity is based on that what was we ... what we are as sinful has been redeemed by Christ because of his death. I mean, the principle is exactly the same: That one shares, hoping that someone of a different nature, or perhaps higher, can actually help you to carry what you cannot carry yourself.

Even as far as, you might say, Subud, there is an indication of Latihan; that it is given to those people who administered the Latihan, that they, if they are the right kind, would take over the kind of thoughts or the feelings that one has in order to be relieved, and that they then would have to take care of it—whatever it is that they have in addition to their own; could, you might say, 'manage' it—because they happen to be the kind of a person who are of a superior, or of a more understanding, nature.

This constant exchange between people of certain ... either by means of shaking hands, physically a certain current which can flow through the hand, or something that can be expressed by the means of one's eyes as if at that moment through the eyes a feeling can be expressed, or that quite definitely that people can sit together without talking and still exchange on a mental plane—all of these things of course are possible. How much one wants to do of that kind, how much actually can be done and how much is hallucination when one has an idea it is taking place when it isn't, that, of course, is very difficult. Because, I can put myself in a state of hoping and believing that someone else is helping; because of that, I am changed, and it may not be anything taking place; only, I have a new belief which releases me at the present time, and based on hallucination or not, it has become reality for me.

So, in this whole affair of an exchanging of thought, exchanging of feelings, an exchange of ordinary physical ... physical, uh, almost I would say a 'materialization of chemicals,' it is quite possible that such things happen, but I am, as a human being, still interested in what is the reaction on me of an actuality—or, of something that I consider to be actual or real—and isn't. Therefore the possibility of actually taking it on a scientific basis and measure it, is practically impossible. Because the measurement would have to be done by something like an instrument of oneself which psychologically is, I've used the word, 'calibrated.' It's impossible for me to have a psyche compared to another psyche. I have no means of telling what my psyche is doing. I can say it is there. In a general way I can say, "Yes, it is similar to that"—if I want to put it in words, I would use such words—but when it is really a psychological experience, I can *not* put it

in words—otherwise, it would not be psychological.

Questioner: Mr. Nyland, do you, uh, believe in any of this idea about the very fact that you are bringing something which you perhaps would have avoided all your life but you suddenly even meet this person that you are speaking of, and you have the strength to let this thing come out even if you are afraid of it—say, it's a feeling that you don't want; particularly, it might be very unpleasant. And usually this is the case as far as, uh... Psychoanalysis goes much more after those things which are so-called 'repressed' than it goes after the other things, because according to this, there are ... the positive things are underneath all of this other stuff, this repression.

Mr. Nyland: Maybe. Whatever is repression in one, may not be in another case, and whatever one calls 'negative,' another might call 'positive.' It is quite possible. If people are disturbed and then are suffering and are looking for some way out, and that when they meet someone with whom they can have confidence, they trust him with their thoughts, even their deeper thoughts; and they don't mind, so they let their hair down in the presence of a psychologist or a psychiatrist, and it's relieved. There's no question about it. Whenever anything of that kind is expressed, either in words or in a relaxation—as I say, letting your hair down—simply means that I am not under this influence. Of course, it must give a certain relief. I do not know how permanent.

Questioner: Yea. That's what I was thinking.

Mr. Nyland: But, aside from that, the fact is that I am in the presence of that person—exactly the same as when I sit in the Sun, I must get warm.

Questioner: Uh, huh.

Mr. Nyland: There's no question about such things taking place. But, the permanency, of course, is important. But, for a little while I can get relief by having a tranquilizing drug. Or, even if I am in the presence of someone who, for some reason or other, reminds me of his love for me and maybe because of that I get in an entirely different state in the presence of that person; and then afterwards I leave, maybe the memory of that person can help me, but it may not be strong enough, really, to sustain me.

Questioner: I see. Well, what interests me mostly is the fact that it might or it might not be a possibility for trying to deal with the emotions or certain emotions that you, uh, let's say if you have Worked—or tried to Work—more on an emotional level and you find that certain emotions are very mechanical.

Mr. Nyland: Wait a minute. Now, when you say you tried to Work...

Questioner: Yea.

Mr. Nyland: But, then you mean it in Gurdjieffian terms.

Questioner: Yes, Mr. Nyland. I'm talking about that. That was the only, uh, reason why I was interested in this, because...

Mr. Nyland: That is right.

Questioner: ...according to this theory, you ... the very fact that you bring these things up to the surface if they are so-called 'negative' and you have the courage to let them come out will, in itself, give you freedom...

Mr. Nyland: No.

Questioner: ...it will make you lose interest in this negative thing that you have.

Mr. Nyland: Not when it is something that is sufficiently ingrained. You cannot lose it. You don't lose it. You may temporarily have a relief, it will come back. There is no one who, because of worry, will ultimately lose the worry, and of course, then the worry remains in existence. You can share it, but it will come back. And you can share it among several people, but after a little while the other people are not caused ... having not the worry you have. All they have is the sharing of it; that also dribbles out, and I still have the worry -- [inaudible] --, and it stays.

Questioner: Uh, huh.

Mr. Nyland: It creates, in me, an emotional state. Sometimes I rebel, sometimes I am jealous, sometimes I do everything possible and I hate the condition in which I am ... in which I am emotionally involved because I happen to do this or that—whatever it is.

As far as Work is concerned, there is only *one* way: That is, that I become Aware of that what is produced, by my emotion, in my physical state. It's the only way by which I can actually end, permanently, and get rid of it. That is, if I am in a state of Awake, all such things will disappear. Or, if they disappear, they will disappear in such a way that I still, from the standpoint of being Awake, I see them acting on me, and with this, I see the value of them—the relative value—which I never could see when I am in it. Because of this, when I stay Awake I have a chance to judge the value—of the good reason or not a good reason—for whatever it is; that is, hallucination will definitely disappear, whatever is an actual fact that has caused my emotional state, I will then be able to see in its true value. Then, because of this added

knowledge, I will be able, how to deal with it. But, in many cases, that what is an ordinary emotional state as represented in the state of myself is, I become neutral and Impartial to my feeling physically, the emotion will disappear.

Questioner: Do you think there is any truth to this negative on top of the positive and...

Mr. Nyland: No. I think it is [inaudible]. It doesn't matter. Because, there is nothing positive or negative. Both are there. Because one is the negative, one time the positive, and the two will not link because they are positive *and* negative—otherwise, I would not have either one or the other. So, it's impossible for me to say, "Yes, I did like you but I like someone else"; and these two can now be linked so that "I like both," I stay exactly in the same state.

Only when I say, "Yes, if I could take ... equate *all* my negativity with *all* my positivity," that is a possibility regarding Work. And the true meaning of a neutralizer is that it takes *both* the negativity and the positivity in One—with the neutralizer, combining it, becoming One as an entity. But that's an entirely different kind of a process. That's a process that only can take place when one is Awake. Because the Awareness and the energy which is then furnished, is necessary for the fusion of the three component parts. And that is ... that is, as I say, quite a different kind of a process, and it is entirely different from the ordinary way of even sharing my sorrows.

Questioner: Yes, well, Mr. Nyland, one of the main distinctions in this theory would be that in order to, uh, work this other way, of this theory, you have to be identified and let yourself, uh, let whatever comes, out; and you are identified with whatever it is that you're feeling, and you are just letting this identification take hold of you, and you're letting out what you have inside that you're repressing, onto somebody else. But, that's identification, would you not say that?

Mr. Nyland: You stay identified because you are not ... you are giving it away, it still is your own. You are not sharing it. You have a little less. It eliminates part of it, certainly; it's exactly like you have a wound and you put some salve on it. Or, you have a mosquito bite, and ammonia goes on. Or poison ivy and sometimes an analgesic. Surely, it's getting relief; there's no question about it. There's a question of, if I have a definite negative feeling, I can always eliminate it by another kind of a feeling which is a little stronger.

Questioner: Um, may I ask you this, please? Um, why is it that, uh, in bringing out this feeling and whatever this feeling is that you are bringing out, why is it that it would not be permanent if you...

Mr. Nyland: Because there is...

Questioner: ...brought it out to your so-called 'consciousness.'

Mr. Nyland: The cause is not taken away. The cause is not valued. If I can see the proper cause of certain things functioning mechanically, I can eliminate them by opposing them with a force that I know where to apply it. This is the advantage I get when I am 'away' from it, as it were, in a state of Awareness: I can see and look at things Objectively. I cannot do it when I am in the midst of it, because I must remain subjective. That what appeals to me seems tremendously ... if I am 'there,' it is just that. This is the difference in viewpoint. I can muddle along, and in ordinary life of course I muddle along, because after a little while the impact of an emotional worry also wears out. Or, I have a lot of other things that take their place and there is no room for it. Whatever it may be, it simply will be eliminated like everything will be eliminated, gradually it is the same: A force that has to spend itself.

But, it is not the way ... of how to *use* whatever there is of that force, isn't by letting it go if, by letting a negative emotion simply dribble out until it has gone into the gutter, that energy is gone for me. If I, at the moment when there is still a strong force and it has an effect on my physical body and then I become, regarding that, Objective, there is force left. I eliminate it from being expressed in my physical body, but being Awake, it is used for the formation of Kesdjan.

You see, in that sense, there is nothing lost for me. In the other, I lose everything—not that the energy itself is lost; it just stays in the atmosphere somewhere; surely, energy cannot be lost, but, it is lost for me.

Questioner: Yes, I see exactly what you mean.

Mr. Nyland: And whenever it happens to be there in me, I want to claim it. I don't want to give anything up unless I know that it is useful; but as long as it's a form of energy of some kind, even if the cause is a negative one I want to use it.

Questioner: I see.

Mr. Nyland: You see? Wherever I find life, life must be used for the purpose of the continuation of life; and if it can flow through me and receive its proper manifestation it's correct, but if I close my eyes to it, it will go somewhere else and I will remain dead, practically.

It is a good thing to have negative emotions. It's absolutely useful, but it's got to be understood on the basis of Work. It cannot be understood on the basis of suppressing it.

Suppression creates psychological ill which, at a certain time, will explode. It's utterly idiotic. If a negative emotion which is not expressed is simply, you say you sit there with a poker face, my God, what goes on in you? And the state of it probably can create a stomach ache—whatever it may be, but it's not used for the purpose of Work.

Questioner: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: It's only because I have a poker face, so I don't show it. It's all right. In ordinary life, it's fine. But, it's not the using of the negative emotion, and it's not really suppressing it.

It's a question of accepting it and seeing what happens, and then in that an opening is made into the Conscious area, and the amount of energy as represented by the negative emotion goes then into the Conscious area of developing Kesdjan. This is the purpose of a negative emotion, and for that I have to be Awake. If I am not Awake, the door is closed. Many times this nonsense of—what's his name—Collin Smith, or even Ouspensky, it's idiotic! Non-expression of negative emotion; only once it is good!: When you really can be Awake. When you are Awake, it is gone. Then it has a purpose ... a possible purpose. Such a stupid [inaudible]; as I say, poker face.

Questioner: Uh, what seems to confuse me sometimes, when I am trying to search – [inaudible] -, that this person would keep up bringing up the causes, and approach the cause of this thing as though it was understood, you know, that...

Mr. Nyland: He doesn't know any more, probably. If he knows where the cause is, good, then trace it to the cause—to the source, where it is.

Questioner: Well, when I say 'cause,' you know the usual story: It was either your mother did this to you, or...

Mr. Nyland: Ah, forget about it.

Questioner: ...or your father did that to you. Something like that.

Mr. Nyland: Forget about it. Maybe the toenail of your grandparents, or... [laughter]. It is such nonsense. But, we go into that nonsense because we have absolutely no further idea of what it is. And then immediately they have a lovely little word for it—the 'complex' of some kind, and so forth—and the psychiatrist sits there and writes it down, writes it down, writes it down.

Moreover, it is passed, and what is there now, at the present time? You go again. You say you have a 'mother complex,' or, from everything that's indicated, I have now a mother complex and I talk to you about it.

I remember, someone ... we were looking at a beautiful sky, the sunset. It happened to be in Thailand, and the tropics, uh, the sunsets are sometimes very, very lovely. We were on a boat and there it was. And he looked at it, and I looked at it, and I enjoyed it, and he did and said, “You see,” he said, “that is all sex.” [laughter] And I looked at him and said, “What the hell is it.” But, you see, there are [laughter] then everything is translated into terms in which they think—that the psychiatrist has told him that he is a very sexual boy. And so what? Creating nonsense. The German, huh? There is the saying. You know German a little bit? [German, inaudible]: When there is no concept, there is always a word that will be put in its place. [laughter]

New Questioner: If you have a negative emotion, say, that you really can express, um, in a practical situation, do you just try to be conscious of what’s going on?

Mr. Nyland: It always is expressed, but maybe not in words. It is an expression that stays in your body.

Questioner: You should express it. If you slam a door, or something like that.

Mr. Nyland: It doesn’t matter. The expression is all right.

Questioner: But, you shouldn’t stop that.

Mr. Nyland: Not at all. You should try to be present to it. You should try to see it: “Look, this body is expressing an emotion.” It is that ... exactly that expression that could become, for you, the means of seeing “this is what it does, under the influence of that.” Instead of not doing it ... because if you break a glass or a tumbler, or you get so mad that you hit someone, you are a little stupid because it is a little bit too far, so one has to use common sense. All the time use common sense. But otherwise, my God, let yourself go! Swear at traffic when you sit in a car—and don’t let the policeman hear it. Whatever it is, yes! But, while you do this become Aware of this body doing it; and then that, whatever may have been the cause, you try to accept as something the body is doing.

You see? I become Aware of that state of me—where a negative emotion can really result in this kind of a behavior—and I accept it. I don’t go against it. I take it. I take it for whatever it is. I do not judge it. I can explain it, I can talk about it, but I take it as it is; and at *that* moment, when I take it, that what is now my body is under a *neutral* Observation, and because of that, the body will not be allowed to be an, uh, a playground for my feelings. This is what takes place when I Wake Up.

Questioner: I suppose you're in the habit of suppressing your feelings. Should you then try to let the body express more?

Mr. Nyland: I wouldn't. I think that people in general, because of ordinary culture or education, suppress many times, in what you want to say, something you don't want to say. You don't want to say it because a little child is there and he shouldn't hear it. You want to say it at the time when you think is the right psychological moment. Because at the present time so-and-so hasn't eaten lunch yet so he probably will not understand what you have in mind and all these kind of things, we suppress all the time. There is nothing new about suppressing emotions.

The question is: what can be useful and if I try, at a certain time when it is really not dangerous, to express that. Many times I have said, "Walk on the street you feel as if you want to sing." Well, sing when there is a big truck going by. Do it. Go out in the moon and howl your head off. You remember the little story about the boy who wants to sell papers? The old lady asks him, he says "ohh-uuuhhh! [howling noise]" So-and-so sent him there, you know: "Two cents, two cents!" And the lady asks him, "Two cents, is it?" "Yes, if you want one." "No," she says, "but how much did you pay for it?" He says, "Two cents." She says, "But you don't make any money." The boy says, "Yes, but it gives me a chance to holler." [laughter]

It is that kind of relief. Sometimes it is absolutely necessary to do it. Almost an impossible situation, but you do it. And someone looks at you and says, "What do I ... what do you ... what are you up ... what has gotten in to you." Hello ... you say "Good morning" and someone says, "What's good about it?" Yes, I know that; at the same time, I wish to say, "Good morning."

You see, the expression of emotions, one must not be too afraid and gradually learn how to dare to say certain things in a surrounding where it cannot do any particular harm, and where one need not be afraid of having criticism. One starts with that. Animals, it's a tremendous field. Little children, also a good field; you won't harm them, and they will not criticize. They will at most say, "Look at the *grand-père*, what is..." [chuckle] You know?

Now we are closing ourselves up much too much, and in not expressing it we lower the possibility of that Octave of emotion ever to grow up. And, it is one of the means by which one ought to grow, because it's the *one means* by which the Soul will start. It is the only means that the mental center has for the Soul to get started on the right road. The 'Do-Re-Mi' of the Soul runs parallel to the 'Sol-La-Si' of the emotional body, and when the 'Sol-La-Si' starts to grow, it becomes the guiding light for the 'Do-Re-Mi' of Soul. It is as if this emotional body holds its

hand up to the Soul so that I can walk. Now, it is absolutely necessary. That is one of the ... one of the things that makes us alive, and it is the one thing that becomes, for oneself, the spearhead of one's own existence—that is feeling, and in many ways it is superior to my heart.

Now, express it. Do what you can. So, children, huh? This is a task. Now you have something to work with. All right, darling?

See you tonight. [inaudible] Now you're going to Work, huh?

End of tape